

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

**THE MEDICUS FIRM, INC.,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**HAROLD LIVINGSTON,\***

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. **3:18-CV-2330-L**

**ORDER**

Before the court is Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction, and Related Relief (Doc. 58), filed March 27, 2019. On August 16, 2019, the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge ("Report") (Doc. 98) was entered, recommending that the court deny Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief, but allow Plaintiff to file an amended motion for injunctive relief after conducting discovery. No objections to the Report were filed.


After carefully reviewing the motion, briefs, evidence, and Report, the court determines that the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge are correct, and **accepts** them as those of the court. Accordingly, as Plaintiff has not satisfied all of the requirements for injunctive relief, the court **denies** Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and **denies without prejudice** Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, and Related Relief (Doc. 58). As indicated in the Report, if discovery reveals that Defendant Harold Livingston has solicited other specific

---

\* The claims against Pacific Companies, Inc. were dismissed without prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction and improper venue by separate order on August 30, 2019.

clients of Plaintiff in violation of the nonsolicitation agreement, Plaintiff may filed an amended motion for preliminary injunction.

**It is so ordered** this 3rd day of September, 2019.

  
Sam A. Lindsay  
United States District Judge